



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,471	04/12/2006	Tokuyuki Nakayama	034145.003	3209

441 7590 01/14/2008
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL
1130 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 1130
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

MCNEIL, JENNIFER C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/575,471	NAKAYAMA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jennifer McNeil	1794		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 4-8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because they are multiple dependent claims which depend from multiple dependent claim 3. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/593287. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed subject matter of the instant claim is commensurate with that of the copending application. The instant claim refers to a conductive film comprising Ga, In, O, and the gallium is present in an amount which overlaps that of the copending application. Furthermore, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have selected the overlapping portion of the ranges disclosed by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to be a *prima facie* case of obviousness, *In re Malagari*, 182 USPQ 549.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe (US 2003/0218153) in view of Minami et al (JP 409259640A). Abe teaches a thin film laminate for an EL device. The laminates are made of transparent conductive films such as In-W-Ge-O (0163, 0245). Abe does not teach a specific transparent conductive oxide comprising gallium and indium. Minami teaches a transparent conductive film comprising 15-49 atomic % gallium formed on a glassy ceramic substrate or a plastic organic substrate. Minami teaches that the conductive film has low resistance and an excellent optical property. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the transparent conductive oxide of Minami in the EL device of Abe as Minami teaches that the film has low resistance and excellent optical properties. The instant claims recite 49.1 atomic % as the lower range of gallium. The range taught by Minami is substantially close to that of the instant claims, and one of ordinary skill would have expected compositions that are in

such close proportions to those in prior art to be *prima facie* obvious, and to have same properties (*Titanium Metals Corp.*, 227 USPQ 773 (CA FC 1985)).

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jang (US 6,391,462) in view of Minami et al (JP 409259640A). Jang teaches an optical filter for a plasma display with multiple transparent conductive layers such as ZnO, indium oxide, tin oxide, including oxides doped with gallium (see abstract). Jang does not teach a specific transparent conductive oxide comprising gallium and indium. Minami teaches a transparent conductive film comprising 15-49 atomic % gallium formed on a glassy ceramic substrate or a plastic organic substrate. Minami teaches that the conductive film has low resistance and an excellent optical property. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the transparent conductive oxide of Minami in the optical filter of Jang as Minami teaches that the film has low resistance and excellent optical properties. The instant claims recite 49.1 atomic % as the lower range of gallium. The range taught by Minami is substantially close to that of the instant claims, and one of ordinary skill would have expected compositions that are in such close proportions to those in prior art to be *prima facie* obvious, and to have same properties (*Titanium Metals Corp.*, 227 USPQ 773 (CA FC 1985)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer McNeil whose telephone number is 571-272-1540. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jennifer McNeil
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1794

JCM

/Jennifer McNeil/